

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 39-52 are pending.

Claims 39-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneier et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,956,404 in view of Glass, U.S. Patent No. 6,553,494.

Independent claim 39 recites in part “providing a log list comprising previously generated digital signatures.” See also independent claims 43 and 50. The examiner had cited column 11, lines 25-29 for teaching a log. However, a further reading of the description of Schneier’s log reveals that he maintains “requests for some operation of information” in the log. Kindly refer to column 11, lines 33, 34 and 41, 42. Schneier does not teach or suggest “providing a log list comprising previously generated digital signatures.”

In claim 39 as previously presented, a wherein clause recited that the input data on which hash operation was performed included a digital signature that was previously registered in the log list. In the Office action mailed March 29, 2006, the examiner did not discuss where this was shown in Schneier or in Glass. To be more clear on this aspect of the present invention, amended independent claim 39 substantively recites in part “computing a hash value of a message (or its hash value) and an earlier generated digital signature (or its hash value) obtained from the log list.” See also independent claims 43 and 50. Schneier does not show the recited log list comprising previously generated digital signatures. Schneier therefore does not show or suggest “computing a hash value of a message (or its hash value) and an earlier generated digital signature (or its hash value) obtained from the log list.”

Claim 39 further recites in part “registering as log data the generated digital signature in the log list.” See also independent claims 43 and 50. Schneier does not show the recited log list comprising previously generated digital signatures, and so does not show “registering as log data the generated digital signature in the log list.”

Claim 39 further recites in part “distributing a signature-attached data including the generated digital signature, the message to be signed, and the earlier generated digital signature or the hash value thereof.” Glass was cited for showing this limitation; specifically, Fig. 1 and column 4, lines 25-39, column 5, line 57 to column 6, line 6 were cited. Fig. 1 of

Amendment Submitted with Requested for Continued
Examination Under 37 C.F.R. 1.114

Glass shows a series of processes including combining a token 12 being with a document 14, which are then hashed. The resulting hash value 16 is combined with biometric data 26, which are then hashed. The resulting unencrypted digital signature 36 is encrypted to produce the digital signature 28. By contrast, claim 39 recites "a signature-attached data including the generated digital signature," which would correspond to Glass' element 28.

However, claim 39 further recites the signature-attached data includes "the message to be signed, and the earlier generated digital signature." Fig. 1 of Glass does not show that his digital signature 28 is combined with document 14, or with an earlier generated digital signature. Glass therefore does not show the recited "distributing a signature-attached data including the generated digital signature, the message to be signed, and the earlier generated digital signature or the hash value thereof."

The Section 103 rejections of the claims are therefore believed to be overcome.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,


George B. F. Yee
Reg. No. 37,478

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
GBFY:cmm
60754915 v1